

Serial No. 09/989,397

Docket No. P-0295

Amendment dated March 24, 2006

Reply to Office Action of December 27, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-30 are pending in this application. By this Reply, claims 1, 3, 6, 13, 15 and 18 are amended, and new claims 25-30 are added.

Claims 1-24 were previously rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Rosin (U.S. Patent No. 6,411,307, hereinafter "Rosin 1") in view of Rosin et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0012024, hereinafter "Rosin 2"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The proposed combination of Rosin 1 and Rosin 2 fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness as required under Section 103. Independent claims 1 and 13 broadly recite the features of the invention. Claims 1 and 13 recite that the channel number range destination window includes a plurality of groups of channel numbers, each group having a prescribed range of channel numbers, which is different from each group, and the channel numbers arranged within the channel guide window of the search menu correspond to the prescribed range of the group selected by the user.

In an embodiment of the invention disclosed in the specification, the channel number range destination window (75) includes a plurality of groups of channel numbers and the channels displayed in the channel guide window (72) correspond to the prescribed range of the group selected by the user. As shown therein, if the range of channels 1-10 is selected the channel guide window (72) displays channels 1-10. As can be appreciated, if the channel range is

Serial No. **09/989,397**

Docket No. **P-0295**

Amendment dated **March 24, 2006**

Reply to Office Action of **December 27, 2005**

11-20 in the channel number range destination window, the channel guide window (72) will display channels 11-20.

Both Rosin 1 and Rosin 2 fail to disclose or teach such features. It is respectfully submitted that since both references fail to disclose such features and the combination thereof, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established. Hence, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Response to Arguments indicates that the Applicant had not contested the Official Notice. It is respectfully submitted that new claims 26 and 29 recites additional features which are not disclosed or taught by any of these cited references. Hence, in this regard for the features recited in new claims 26 and 29, the Applicant respectfully requests production of a secondary reference teaching such features and the combination thereof.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, **Daniel Y.J. Kim**, at the telephone number listed below.

Serial No. **09/989,397**

Docket No. **P-0295**

Amendment dated **March 24, 2006**

Reply to Office Action of **December 27, 2005**

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP

Daniel Y.J. Kim
Registration No. 36,186

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3701 DYK/dak

Date: March 24, 2006

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610

\\fk4\Documents\2000\2000-227\83918.doc